A U M

The multiplicity of worlds invisible and visible is unity in respect to the unity of God, for nothing else hath being. The Perfect seeth unity in multiplicity, and multiplicity in unity.—*Jemshid in the Desatir.*

THEOSOPHY

Vol. VII DECEMBER, 1918 No. 2

No Theosophical Society, as such, is responsible for any opinion or declaration in this magazine, by whomsoever expressed, unless contained in an official document.

Where any article, or statement, has the author's name attached, he alone is responsible, and for those which are unsigned, the Editors will be accountable.

HAVE ANIMALS SOULS?*

(Continued from November.)

II.

What a chimera is man! what a confused chaos, what a subject of contradiction! a professed judge of all things, and yet a feeble worm of the earth! the great depository and guardian of truth, and yet a mere huddle of uncertainty! the *glory and the scandal* of the universe!—PASCAL.

WE shall now proceed to see what are the views of the Christian Church as to the nature of the soul in the brute, to examine how she reconciles the discrepancy between the resurrection of a dead animal and the assumption that its soul dies with it, and to notice some miracles in connection with animals. Before the final and decisive blow is dealt to that selfish doctrine, which has become so pregnant with cruel and merciless practices toward the poor animal world, the reader must be made acquainted with the early hesitations of the Fathers of the Patristic age themselves, as to the right interpretation of the words spoken with reference to that question by St. Paul.

It is amusing to note how the Karma of two of the most indefatigable defenders of the Latin Church—Messrs. Des Mousseaux and De Mirville, in whose works the record of the few miracles here noted are found—led both of them to furnish the weapons now used against their own sincere but very erroneous views.[1]

The great battle of the Future having to be fought out between the "Creationists" or the Christians, as all the believers in a special creation and a personal god, and the Evolutionists or the Hindus, Buddhists, all the Free-thinkers and last, though not least, most of

* This article was first printed by H. P. Blavatsky in *The Theosophist* for February, 1886.

[1] It is but justice to acknowledge here that De Mirville is the first to recognize the error of the Church in this particular and to defend animal life, as far as he dares do so.

the men of science, a recapitulation of their respective positions is advisable.

1. The Christian world postulates its right over animal life: (*a*) on the afore-quoted Biblical texts and the later scholastic interpretations; (*b*) on the assumed absence of anything like divine or human soul in animals. Man survives death, the brute *does not.*

2. The Eastern Evolutionists, basing their deductions upon their great philosophical systems, maintain it is a sin against nature's work and progress to kill any living being—for reasons given in the preceding pages.

3. The Western Evolutionists, armed with the latest discoveries of science, heed neither Christians nor Heathens. Some scientific men believe in Evolution, others do not. They agree, nevertheless, upon one point: namely, that physical, exact research offers no grounds for the presumption that man is endowed with an immortal, divine soul, any more than his dog.

Thus, while the Asiatic Evolutionists behave toward animals consistently with their scientific and religious views, neither the church nor the materialistic school of science is logical in the practical applications of their respective theories. The former, teaching that every living thing is created singly and specially by God, as any human babe may be, and that it finds itself from birth to death under the watchful care of a wise and kind Providence, allows the inferior creation at the same time only a temporary soul. The latter, regarding both man and animal as the soulless production of some hitherto undiscovered forces in nature, yet practically creates an abyss between the two. A man of science, the most determined materialist, one who proceeds to vivisect a living animal with the utmost coolness, would yet shudder at the thought of laming—not to speak of torturing to death—his fellow-man. Nor does one find among those great materialists who were religiously inclined men any who have shown themselves consistent and logical in defining the true moral status of the animal on this earth and the rights of man over it.

Some instances must now be brought to prove the charges stated. Appealing to serious and cultured minds it must be postulated that the views of the various authorities here cited are not unfamiliar to the reader. It will suffice therefore simply to give short epitomes of some of the conclusions arrived at—beginning with the Churchmen.

As already stated, the Church *exacts* belief in the miracles performed by her great Saints. Among the various prodigies accomplished we shall choose for the present only those that bear directly upon our subject—namely, the miraculous resurrections of dead animals. Now one who credits man with an immortal soul independent of the body it animates can easily believe that by some divine miracle the soul can be recalled and forced back into the tabernacle it deserts apparently forever. But how can one accept the same possibility in the case of an animal, since his faith teaches him that the animal has

no independent soul, since it is annihilated with the body? For over two hundred years, ever since Thomas of Aquinas, the Church has authoritatively taught that the soul of the brute dies with its organism. What then is recalled back into the clay to reanimate it? It is at this juncture that scholasticism steps in, and—taking the difficulty in hand—reconciles the irreconcilable.

It premises by saying that the miracles of the Resurrection of animals are numberless and as well unauthenticated as "the resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ."* The Bollandists give instances without number. As Father Burigny, a hagiograph of the 17th century, pleasantly remarks concerning the bustards *resuscitated* by St. Remi—"I may be told, no doubt, that I am a *goose* myself to give credence to such "blue bird" tales. I shall answer the joker, in such a case, by saying that, if he disputes this point, then must he also strike out from the life of St. Isidore of Spain the statement that he resuscitated from death his master's horse; from the biography of St. Nicolas of Tolentino—that he brought back to life a partridge, instead of eating it; from that of St. Francis—that he recovered from the blazing coals of an oven, where it was baking, the body of a lamb, which he forthwith resurrected; and that he also made *boiled* fishes, which he resuscitated, *swim in their sauce;* etc., etc. Above all he, the sceptic, will have to charge more than 100,000 eye-witnesses—among whom at least a few ought to be allowed some common sense—with being either liars or dupes."

A far higher authority than Father Burigny, namely, Pope Benedict (Benoit) XIV, corroborates and affirms the above evidence. The names, moreover, as eye-witnesses to the resurrections, of Saint Sylvestrus, Francois de Paule, Severin of Cracow and a host of others are all mentioned in the Bollandists. "Only he adds"—says Cardinal de Ventura who quotes him—"that, as resurrection, however, to deserve the name requires the *identical* and *numerical* reproduction of the form,† as much as of the material of the dead creature; and as that form (or soul) of the brute is always annihilated with its body according to St. Thomas' doctrine, God, in every such case finds himself obliged to create for the purpose of the miracle a new form for the resurrected animal; from which it follows that the resurrected brute was *not* altogether *identical* with what it had been before its death (*non idem omnino esse.*)"[1]

Now this looks terribly like one of the *mayas* of magic. However, although the difficulty is not absolutely explained, the following is made clear: the principle, that animated the animal during its life, and which is termed soul, being dead or dissipated after the death of the body, another soul—"a kind of an *informal* soul"—as the Pope and the Cardinal tell us—is *created* for the purpose of miracle by God; a soul, moreover, which is distinct from that of man, which is "an independent, ethereal and ever lasting entity".

---

* *De Beatificatione, etc.,* by Pope Benedict XIV.

† In scholastic philosophy, the word "form" applies to the immaterial principle *which informs or animates the body.*

[1] *De Beatificatione, etc.,* I. IV. c. XI, Art. 6.

Besides the natural objection to such a proceeding being called a "miracle" produced by the saint, for it is simply God behind his back who "creates" for the purpose of his glorification an entirely new soul as well as a new body, the whole of the Thomasian doctrine is open to objection. For, as Descartes very reasonably remarks: "if the soul of the animal is so distinct (in its immaterialty) from its body, we believe it hardly possible to avoid recognizing it as a spiritual principle, hence—an intelligent one."

The reader need hardly be reminded that Descartes held the living animal as being simply an automaton, a "well wound up clock-work," according to Malebranche. One, therefore, who adopts the Cartesian theory about the animal would do as well to accept at once the views of the modern materialists. For, since that automaton is capable of feelings, such as love, gratitude, etc., and is endowed as undeniably with memory, all such attributes must be as materialism teaches us "properties of matter." But if the animal is an "automaton," why not Man? Exact science—anatomy, physiology, etc.,—finds not the smallest difference between the bodies of the two; and who knows—justly enquires Solomon—whether the spirit of man "goeth upward" any more than that of the beast? Thus we find metaphysical Descartes as inconsistent as any one.

But what does St. Thomas say to this? Allowing a soul (*anima*) to the brute, and declaring it *immaterial,* he refuses it at the same time the qualification of *spiritual.* Because, he says: "it would in such case imply *intelligence,* a virtue and a special operation reserved only for the human soul." But as at the fourth Council of Lateran it had been decided the "God had created two distinct substances, the corporeal (*mundanam*) and the spiritual (*spiritualem*), and that something incorporeal must be of necessity spiritual, St. Thomas had to resort to a kind of compromise, which can avoid being called a subterfuge only when performed by a saint. He says: "This soul of the brute is neither spirit, nor body; it is of a middle nature."* This is a very unfortunate statement. For elsewhere, St. Thomas says that "all the souls—even those of plants—have the substantial form of their bodies," and if this is true of plants, why not of animals? It is certainly neither "spirit" nor pure matter, but of that essence which St. Thomas calls "a middle nature." But why, once on the right path, deny it survivance—let alone immortality? The contradiction is so flagrant that De Mirville in despair exclaims, "Here we are, in the presence of three substances, instead of the two, as decreed by the Lateran Council!", and proceeds forthwith to contradict, as much as he dares, the "Angelic Doctor."

The great Bossuet in his *Traité de la Connoissance de Dieu et de soi même* analyses and compares the system of Descartes with that of St. Thomas. No one can find fault with him for giving the preference in the matter of logic to Descartes. He finds the Carte-

---

* Quoted by Cardinal de Ventura in his *Philosophie Chretienne,* Vol. II, p. 386. See also De Mirville, *Résurrections animales.*

sian "invention"—that of the automaton,—as "getting better out of the difficulty" than that of St. Thomas, accepted fully by the Catholic Church; for which Father Ventura feels indignant against Bossuet for accepting "such a miserable and puerile error." And, though allowing the animals a soul with all its qualities of affection and sense, true to his master St. Thomas, he too refuses them intelligence and reasoning powers. "Bossuet," he says, "is the more to be blamed, since he himself has said: 'I foresee that a great war is being prepared against the Church under the name of Cartesian philosophy.'" He is right there, for out of the "sentient matter" of the brain of the brute animal comes out quite naturally Locke's *thinking matter,* and out of the latter all the materialistic schools of our century. But when he fails, it is through supporting St. Thomas' doctrine, which is full of flaws and evident contradictions. For, if the soul of the animal is, as the Roman Church teaches, an informal, immaterial principle, then it becomes evident that, being independent of physical organism, it cannot "die with the animal" any more than in the case of man. If we admit that it subsists and survives, in what respect does it differ from the soul of man? And that it is eternal—once we accept St. Thomas' authority on any subject—though he contradicts himself elsewhere. "The soul of man is immortal, and the soul of the animal perishes," he says (*Somma,* Vol. V. p. 164),—this, after having queried in Vol. II of the same grand work (p. 256) "are there any beings that re-emerge into nothingness?" and answered himself:—"No, for in the Ecclesiastes it is said: (iii. 14) Whatsoever God doeth, it shall be for ever. With God there is no variableness (James I. 17.)" "Therefore," goes on St. Thomas, "neither in the natural order of things, nor by means of miracles, is there any creature that re-emerges into nothingness (is annihilated); *there is naught in the creature that is annihilated,* for that which shows with the greatest radiance divine goodness is the perpetual conservation of the creatures."[1]

This sentence is commented upon and confirmed in the annotation by the Abbé Drioux, his translator. "No;" he remarks—"nothing is annihilated; it is a principle that has become with modern science a kind of axiom."

And, if so, why should there be an exception made to this invariable rule in nature, recognized both by science and theology,—only in the case of the soul of the animal? Even though *it had no intelligence,* an assumption from which every impartial thinker will ever and very strongly demur.

Let us see, however, turning from scholastic philosophy to natural sciences, what are the naturalist's objections to the animal having an intelligent and therefore an independent soul in him.

"Whatever that be, which thinks, which understands, which acts, it is something celestial and divine; and upon that account must necessarily be eternal," wrote Cicero, nearly two millenniums ago. We should understand well, Mr. Huxley contradicting the

[1] *Somma*—Drioux edition in 8 vols.

conclusion,—St. Thomas of Aquinas, the "king of the metaphysicians," firmly believed in the miracles of resurrection performed by St. Patrick.*

Really, when such tremendous claims as the said miracles are put forward and enforced by the Church upon the faithful, her theologians should take more care that their highest authorities at least should not contradict themselves, thus showing ignorance upon questions raised nevertheless to a doctrine.

The animal, then, is debarred from progress and immortality, because he is an automaton. According to Descartes, he has no intelligence, agreeably to mediæval scholasticism; nothing but instinct, the latter signifying involuntary impulses, as affirmed by the materialists and denied by the Church.

Both Frederic and George Cuvier have discussed amply, however, on the intelligence and the instinct in animals.[1] Their ideas upon the subject have been collected and edited by Flourens, the learned Secretary of the Academy of Sciences. This is what Frederic Cuvier, for thirty years the Director of the Zoological Department and the Museum of Natural History at the *Jardin des Plantes*, Paris, wrote upon the subject. "Descartes' mistake, or rather the general mistake, lies in that no sufficient distinction was ever made between intelligence and instinct. Buffon himself had fallen into such an omission, and owing to it every thing in his Zoological philosophy was contradictory. Recognizing in the animal a feeling superior to our own, as well as the consciousness of its actual existence, he denied it at the same time thought, reflection, and memory, consequently every possibility of having thoughts (Buffon. *Discourse on the Nature of Animals*, VII, p. 57)." But, as he could hardly stop there, he admitted that the brute had a kind of memory, active, extensive and more faithful than our (human) memory (*Id. Ibid*, p. 77). Then, after having refused it any intelligence, he nevertheless admitted that the animal "consulted its master, interrogated him, and understood perfectly every sign of his will."(*Id. Ibid*, Vol. X, *History of the Dog*, p. 2.)

A more magnificent series of contradictory statements could hardly have been expected from a great man of science.

The illustrious Cuvier is right therefore in remarking in his turn, that "this new mechanism of Buffon is still less intelligible than Descartes' automaton."*

---

* St. Patrick, it is claimed, has Christianized "the most Satanized country of the globe—Ireland, ignorant *in all save magic.*"—into the "Island of Saints," by resurrecting "sixty men dead years before." *Suscitavit sexaginta mortuos* (Lectio I. ii. from the *Roman Breviary*, 1520). In the M.S. held to be the famous confession of that saint, preserved in the Salisbury Cathedral (*Descript. Hibern.* I. II, C. 1), St. Patrick writes in an autograph letter: "To me the last of men, and the greatest sinner, God has, nevertheless, given, against the magical practices of this barbarous people the gift of miracles, such as had not been given to the greatest of our apostles—since he (God) permitted that among other things (such as the resurrection of animals and creeping things) I should *resuscitate dead bodies reduced to ashes since many years.*" Indeed, before such a prodigy, the resurrection of Lazarus appears a very insignificant incident.

[1] More recently Dr. Romanes and Dr. Butler have thrown great light upon the subject.

* *Biographie Universelle*, Art. by Cuvier on Buffon's Life.

As remarked by the critic, a line of demarcation ought to be traced between instinct and intelligence. The construction of beehives by the bees, the raising of dams by the beaver in the middle of the naturalist's dry floor as much as in the river, are all the deeds and effects of instinct for ever unmodifiable and changeless, whereas the acts of intelligence are to be found in actions evidently thought out by the animal, where not instinct but reason comes into play, such as its education and training calls forth and renders susceptible of perfection and development. Man is endowed with reason, the infant with instinct; and the young animal shows more of both than the child.

Indeed, every one of the disputants knows as well as we do that it is so. If any materialist avoid confessing it, it is through pride. Refusing a soul to both man and beast, he is unwilling to admit that the latter is endowed with intelligence as well as himself, even though in an infinitely lesser degree. In their turn the churchman, the religiously inclined naturalist, the modern metaphysician, shrink from avowing that man and animal are both endowed with soul and faculties, if not equal in development and perfection, at least the same in name and essence. Each of them knows, or ought to know that instinct and intelligence are two faculties completely opposed in their nature, two enemies confronting each other in constant conflict; and that, if they will not admit of two souls or principles, they have to recognize, at any rate, the presence of two potencies in the soul, each having a different seat in the brain, the localization of each of which is well known to them, since they can isolate and temporarily destroy them in turn—according to the organ or part of the organs they happen to be torturing during their terrible vivisections. What is it but human pride that prompted Pope to say:—

"Ask for whose end the heavenly bodies shine;
Earth for whose use? Pride answers, 'Tis for mine.
For *me* kind nature wakes her genial power,
Suckles each herb, and spreads out every flower.
* * * * * *
For me the mine a thousand treasures brings;
For me health gushes from a thousand springs;
Seas roll to waft me, suns to light me rise;
My footstool earth, my canopy the skies!"

And it is the same unconscious pride that made Buffon utter his paradoxical remarks with reference to the difference between man and animal. That difference consisted in the "absence of reflection, for the animal", he says, "does not feel that he feels." How does Buffon know? "It does not think that it thinks," he adds, after having told the audience that the animal remembered, often deliberated, compared and chose![1] Who ever pretended that a cow or a dog could be an idealogist? But the animal may think and know it thinks, the more keenly that it cannot speak, and express its thoughts.

[1] *Discours sur la nature des Animaux.*

How can Buffon or any one else know? One thing is shown however by the exact observations of naturalists and that is, that the animal is endowed with intelligence; and once this is settled, we have but to repeat Thomas Aquinas' definition of intelligence—the prerogative of man's immortal soul—to see that the same is due to the animal.

But in justice to *real* Christian philosophy, we are able to show that primitive Christianity has never preached such atrocious doctrines—the true cause of the falling off of so many of the best men as of the highest intellects from the teachings of Christ and his disciples.

H. P. BLAVATSKY.

(*To be concluded.*)

SELF—SOUL—MIND*

ATMA—BUDDHI—MANAS.

Katha Upanishad 1, 3.

Know Self as Master of the Chariot, and body as the chariot;
Know Soul as Charioteer, Mind also as the reins.

The powers, they call the horses, sensuous things their roads;
Self—powers—Mind united—this, say the wise, is the Enjoyer.

He who is not full of knowledge, with Mind ever ununited;
His powers are unswayed, like the charioteer's unruly horses.

But he who is full of knowledge, with Mind ever united;
His powers are swayed, like the charioteer's well-ruled horses.

He who is not full of knowledge, with Mind unruled, ever impure;
He gains not that Rest,—he returns to circling birth and death.

But he who is full of knowledge, with Mind well ruled, ever pure;
He gains that Rest wherefrom he is not born again.

He who firmly grasps Mind, the reins, like a charioteer full of knowledge;
He gains the Path,—that supreme Rest of the pervading Power.

Than the powers, the impulses are higher; than the impulses Mind is higher;
Than Mind, Soul is higher; than Soul is higher the great Self.

Than the great Self, the Unmanifest is higher; than the Unmanifest, Spirit is higher;
Than Spirit, none is higher at all; this is the end, the supreme way.

---

* This article was printed by Wm. Q. Judge in the *Oriental Department* papers, September-October, 1895.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

CHAPTER VI.

(Continued.)

At the meetings of The United Lodge of Theosophists a part of the time is devoted to Question and Answer. The questions and answers that follow were taken stenographically while "The Ocean of Theosophy," by Wm. Q. Judge, was being studied.

It should be remembered that while the answers are given from the standpoint of many years' experience and application, they are not to be taken as hard and fast definitions, nor as authoritative; but may be used as explanations and applications of the philosophy of Theosophy as related to the particular phases presented in the various questions. Each student, being "the final authority" for himself, should not accept any statement by any being whatever unless he himself perceives its truth.

Beginning with Chapter I of the "Ocean," the succeeding chapters will be taken up seriatim.

Q. What is the difference between the Astral Plane and the Astral Light?

A. The Astral Light is the invisible plane or region that surrounds our earth—as it does every other; it is a subtle essence visible only to a clairvoyant eye, and the lowest but one (the physical) of the Seven Kosmic Principles. Being the lowest envelope in which the earth floats, and by which the latter is permeated, it is the receiver and container of every evil influence; it can only give out what it receives; it is the "storehouse" so to speak of the moral and physical emanations of humanity; these converted into their subtlest essence, are radiated back intensified and become epidemics, moral, psychic, and physical. It corresponds to the *Linga Sarira*, or Astral Double, in Man, which is the storehouse of the individual's moral, psychic and physical tendencies.

A "plane" is a field of action; we speak of acting on the *physical* plane, *astral* plane, *kamic, manasic,* or *spiritual* planes.

Q. Does it affect mankind as a whole?

A. The general effect is ever present; each being is affected according to the attractions he sets up either consciously or unconsciously; the unconscious is due to past karma, the conscious to the setting up of new causes.

Q. If a man thinks high ideals would he attract high ideals?

A. High ideals do not exist of themselves, they are aspirations of individuals, so it would not be a true concept to imagine that there is a storehouse of high ideals somewhere which we can draw upon; we have to perceive, create, and act towards high ideals, in which case our aspirations are re-inforced by the ideals of others upon the same plane of thought and action, due to the interdependence and common spiritual nature of all beings.

Q. Is there any special effort indicated in making a vow or pledge, as stated in the chapter?

A. A vow must be in some direction and for some end in view; this implies special effort. In the Introduction to *Patanjali's Yoga Aphorisms,* Wm. Q. Judge speaks of "a firm position assumed with the end in view of union with the Higher Self." To take this position one must understand the principles of Man and of Nature; our study of the "Ocean" and other works of the Teachers leads in the direction of this special effort, which is in reality the end in view of all our study.

Q. The statement is made that "The God within begins with Manas, or Mind"; what does that mean?

A. There is no action unless there is a being to act or feel its effects; *Manas* is the mani-festing or creative power of the being, the active potency or creator. So far as manifestation is concerned it is the "God within," for manifestation begins with that principle.

Q. Can we work on this physical plane without the principle of Kama?

A. We are at that stage of evolution where the principle of *Kama,* or Desire, prevails generally; this is because "the God within" has become involved in sentient physical existence and while in that transitory existence sets the causes in motion that inevitably bring the being back to a similar state and condition. In physical existence the state of any human being may be *Buddhi-Manasic,* or *Kama-Manasic;* it is *Manasic* action in both cases, but in the former the action is of the nature of the Spiritual Self, while the latter is action performed from a basis of personal desire and selfishness. We can and should act on this plane from a better basis than personal desire; the object of all our studies is to accomplish this and help others to do likewise.

Q. If the Masters can work without the principle of Kama on this plane, why can't we?

A. Because we continue acting from the basis of personal or physical desire; "Freedom from bondage comes from renunciation of self-interest in the fruits of one's action." There is a gulf between the motive of self-interest and that which seeks the good of all creatures and nothing for self. The Masters have the knowledge and power to act on any plane because of Their Selflessness. *Kama* is not *a means* by which action takes place on this plane, but the motive which governs the action.

Q. How can any being contact matter without the principle of Kama?

A. As said before, *Kama* is not an instrument or means by which action or contact takes place, it is a basis or motive in use by the actor; the *instruments* are the astral and physical body. The astral body is a transitory aspect of the substance of the Inner Man

in all cases where the "personality" has not been reduced to a cipher as a basis for conscious action. The exceptions are where the being has formed a "permanent astral" (see *"Culture of Concentration"*). It may be conceived that the Masters have a permanent astral and something more, by which any kingdom of nature or state of matter may be contacted.

Q. When we conquer the tendency to have "the blues" have we lost that Karma?

A. We must get the fact clearly in mind that Karma is Action with its consequent re-action; that the re-action is not something different or separate from the action, but a continuation of it. Karma therefore includes all actions, good or bad, remedial or otherwise. When we remedy a defect, we do it by some action and we receive the consequent re-action; Karma is the Law of "sowing and reaping"; getting the exact results of our thoughts, words, and deeds. We never lose the power to act, so how could we lose our Karma? We are Karma.

Q. Then holding the idea of joy instead of despondency is an affirmation is it not?

A. No it is not. It is a holding to the happiest moment of one's life, an actual experience that we have had, and not an affirmation of something we imagine.

Q. Then you do not deny "the blues"?

A. Neither affirmation or denial is used. It is folly to deny what we have actual experience of; such denial is simply lying to ourselves and brings us nothing but ignorance and misery in the end. What is needed is knowledge, and knowledge comes only by experience; we must learn to discriminate between that which makes for the highest good and that which holds us back; we could not know pleasure without having known pain; good, without evil; health, without sickness, etc.; it is only through the "pairs of opposites" that we know anything. Knowledge is acquired only through experience; it cannot be "affirmed"; nor can any "denial" take away from an individual what he actually knows.

Q. Can anyone save another?

A. No being, however high, can do that. But one with knowledge can show another how to obtain the knowledge he has gained; by following the path that leads to wisdom the ignorant become wise. There is no other way.

Q. In the state of Kama Rupa we have to overcome and throw off all those desires that we have in the physical body. Is that correct?

A. Presuming that it is well understood that the *Kama Rupa* is only formed *after death*, and is, as the name implies, the "body of desire", the prevailing action is along the line of desire in that body while the being is tied to it; but just as we died out of the physical

body in which we created the tendencies of the *Kama Rupa,* so we in time die out of the *Kama Rupa* and ascend to the *Devachanic* state or condition. Neither in *Kama-Loca,* nor in *Devachan,* have we the power to throw off the tendencies we have created during our life-time in the body; in one, we experience the evil effects, and in the other the good effects of "the life last lived". The only time we have in which to establish good causes, is during life-time in the body.

Q. Does dying out of the Kama-Rupa end those desires?

A. It does not. If we have not corrected or eliminated those "desires" during our life-time, we will have the tendency to do as we did before, when we once more enter a new physical body. These "desires" are not caused by the physical body, the astral body or *Kama Rupa,* but by ourselves as conscious beings while occupying a body. There is no salvation after death.

Q. In the process of evolution we rise by means of this lower principle of desire, and then we have to crush out that same principle. Am I right?

A. No, you have a wrong conception of Evolution, it would seem. Evolution, properly speaking, is the unfolding or growth of consciousness. All beings begin as, let us say, a spark of consciousness. Growth or unfolding comes from conscious experience, beginning in the highest state of manifested matter and by the action of consciousness, producing more and more concrete states of matter until the physical is reached. Evolution begins from above and descends to the lower, then, when the lower is conquered, that is to say, is known in its true relation to the being involved, and use is made of the lower instruments according to the behests of the Spirit, the ascent is made plus the experience gained. Personal, selfish desire is the outcome of ignorance of our real nature and goal; because of this ignorance we set in motion those causes which re-produce the desire for sentient existence with all its selfish expressions. We do not rise by selfish desires, we do not progress by means of them; we become involved in them. Knowledge and effort in the right direction will alone free us from our self-made bonds.

Q. How long does the Ego stay in Devachan?

A. As *Devachan* is an effect of the life last lived, even if the "effect" is that of the highest and best of that life, the stay in that state varies in kind, quality and duration with each Ego. It may vary from thousands of years, to a very short period; but it must be remembered that "time" to the "departed" is not measured by the earth's rotation, but by the changes in consciousness experienced; "a day is as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day".

Q. I think it is very discouraging to say the least.

A. It ought not to be when we realize that it is altogether in our own hands. Whatever comes to us whether good or bad arises

from our own thoughts, words and deeds. Discouragement might be felt by those who would like to get what they have not merited, but those who see the truth and do their whole duty see no discouragement anywhere.

Q. What does it mean by the bridge between the Higher and Lower Manas?

A. Any bridge has to be constructed. *Manas* is the power to think and create. "Higher" means thought and creation from a spiritual basis; "Lower" from a personal, physical, and selfish basis. The real basis and cause lies in the "Higher"; it should be the nature of the "Lower" to express the "Higher", and we, who are now in the self-made bonds of the "Lower" have to begin to act in accordance with the nature of the "Higher". We do this by Thought and effort, acting for and as the One Self in all that we think, do or say; in this way we make the "bridge" that joins the "Lower" to the "Higher".

Q. Can you say that you have formed this bridge?

A. I can't say, because a categorical answer would do no good, but I think this may be said, that everyone who studies and applies Theosophy, from the very first begins the building of this bridge; every thought in that direction supplies material for the building, and the time must come—if persistent effort is made—when the "builder" will by means of the bridge have one domain instead of two; will live a conscious life in Spirit, even while occupying temporary bodies of flesh.

THE ORIGIN OF THE CHRISTMAS TREE*[1]

THE custom of the Christmas tree is a very recent institution. It is of a late date not only in Russia, but also in Germany, where it was first established and whence it spread everywhere, in the New as well as in the Old World. In France the Christmas tree was adopted only after the Franco-German war, later therefore than 1870. According to Prussian chronicles, the custom of lighting the Christmas tree as we now find it in Germany was established about a hundred years ago. It penetrated into Russia about 1830, and was very soon adopted throughout the Empire by the richer classes.

It is very difficult to trace the custom historically. Its origin belongs undeniably to the highest antiquity. Fir trees have ever been held in honour by the ancient nations of Europe. As evergreen plants, and symbols of never-dying vegetation, they were sacred to the nature-deities, such as Pan, Isis and others. According to ancient folklore the pine was born from the body of the nymph Pitys[2] (the Greek name of that tree), the beloved of the gods Pan

* This article was first printed by H. P. Blavatsky in *Lucifer* for March, 1891.

[1] From an article by Dr. Kaygorodoff in the *Novoyê Vremya*.

[2] A nymph beloved by the god Pan and changed into a fir tree.—[Eds. *Lucifer*.]

and Boreas. During the vernal festivals in honour of the great goddess of Nature, fir trees were brought into the temples decorated with fragrant violets.

The ancient Northern peoples of Europe had a like reverence for the pine and fir trees in general, and made great use of them at their various festivals. Thus, for instance, it is well known that the pagan priests of ancient Germany, when celebrating the first stage of the sun's return toward the vernal equinox, held in their hands highly ornamented pine branches. And this points to the great probability of the now Christian custom of lighting Christmas trees being the echo of the pagan custom of regarding the pine as a symbol of a solar festival, the precursor of the birth of the Sun. It stands to reason that its adoption and establishment in Christian Germany imparted to it a new, and so to speak, Christian form.* Thence fresh legends—as is always the case—explaining in their own way the origin of the ancient custom. We know of one such legend, remarkably poetical in its charming simplicity, which purports to give the origin of this now universally prevailing custom of ornamenting Christmas trees with lighted wax tapers.

Near the cave in which was born the Saviour of the world grew three trees—a pine, an olive, and a palm. On that holy eve when the guiding star of Bethlehem appeared in the heavens, that star which announced to the long-suffering world the birth of Him, who brought to mankind the glad tidings of a blissful hope, all nature rejoiced and is said to have carried to the feet of the Infant-God her best and holiest gifts.

Among others the olive tree that grew at the entrance of the cave of Bethlehem brought forth its golden fruit; the palm offered to the Babe its green and shadowy vault, as a protection against heat and storm; alone the pine had nought to offer. The poor tree stood in dismay and sorrow, vainly trying to think what it could present as a gift to the Child-Christ. Its branches were painfully drooping down, and the intense agony of its grief finally forced from its bark and branches a flood of hot transparent tears, whose large resinous and gummy drops fell thick and fast around it. A silent star, twinkling in the blue canopy of heaven, perceived these tears; and forthwith, confabulating with her companions—lo, a miracle took place. Hosts of shooting stars fell down, like unto a great rain shower, on the pine until they twinkled and shone from every needle, from top to bottom. Then trembling with joyful emotion, the pine proudly raised her drooping branches and appeared for the first time before the eyes of a wondering world, in most dazzling brightness. From that time, the legend tells us, men adopted the habit of ornamenting the pine tree on Christmas Eve with numberless lighted candles.

---

* As in the case of many other such customs, and even dogmas, borrowed and preserved without the least acknowledgment. If the source is now confessed, it is because in the face of research and discovery it can no longer be helped.—[EDS. *Lucifer*.]

THE MAHOMEDAN TRADITION OF ISSA OR IESUS*

From the Persian of Mirkhond, 1432-1498 *A. D.*

IT is related after Solmân the Persian that, when all the sick of Nassibin had been healed, the people requested Issa to resuscitate a dead man. His lordship said: "Whatever deceased person you may point out I shall recall him to life by the permission of the Living Immortal One".

They said: "Sâm, the son of Nuh, is our ancestor; his corpse is not far from this place, if thou consentest to resuscitate it by thy sublime breathings". Issa agreed, and the people conducted him to a tomb where the Spirit of Allah [*i. e.,* Jesus] fell on his knees raising his hands in supplication.

After he had terminated his devotions, he called out to Sâm, by the command of the Creator of heaven and earth, whereon the soil moved and opened, when a man with a gray head and beard issued from the tomb, and said: "I obey, O Spirit of Allah".

Then he harangued those present as follows:

"O people, this is Issa, the son of the blessèd virgin Mariam, the spirit of Allah, and His word which he is preaching. You must believe in his prophetic dignity and follow him".

Issa asked Sâm:

"In your time the hair of men never became gray; how is this [that yours is so]?"

He replied:

"When I heard thy voice, I thought that the resurrection was at hand, and I was so awed that my hair turned gray".

Issa again asked:

"How many years is it since thou art dead?" Sâm replied: "Four thousand years".

Issa continued: "I shall pray that Allah—whose name be extolled—may allow thee to live for some time".

Sâm [however] replied: "Since it will, after all, be necessary to taste the unpleasant beverage of death, I wish not for this miserable life, and I still remember my agonies of death. I beseech thee to implore the Almighty—whose name be extolled—to receive me into the propinquity of His mercy". Issa then prayed, Sâm returned to his former condition, and the particles of earth again united [and covered him].

Solmân the Persian narrated that, when the King of Nassibin and his people had witnessed this miracle, he with his army, followers and subjects believed in Issa.

One of the strange events and wonderful prodigies of Issa—upon whom be peace—was the appearance and descent of the table which took place as follows:

---

* This article was printed by Wm. Q. Judge in the *Oriental Department* papers, November, 1894.

The apostles who were always with Issa, happened on a certain occasion to be hungry, with a great multitude of people, when they were travelling. All the people asked Issa to beseech the Almighty Creator to send down from heaven a table full of victuals; the apostles however rejected this proposal, but the people urged them to acquaint Issa with their wish, wherefore the Messiah was informed of their request.

He whose name be glorified has said:

"The apostles said: O Issa, son of Mariam, is thy Lord able to cause a table to descend to us from heaven? He answered: "Fear Allah if ye be true believers".

The apostles replied in the words of the people: "We deny not the power of Allah, but we wish to eat of that table, to comfort our thoughts and so increase our faith in thy words, so that we may be convinced, that thou art indeed the messenger of Allah and that thy words are true. After having eaten of the table we shall all be compelled to acknowledge the unity and omnipotence of Allah, as well as the truth of thy prophecy and messengership".

Some have, with reference to the words "that we may be witnesses thereof", asserted that they imply a pledge of the people to bear testimony in his favor, on their return to the children of Esrâïl.

After they had repeatedly proffered their request, Issa—upon whom be peace—humbly supplicated saying: "O Allah our Lord cause a table to descend to us from heaven, that [the day of its descent] may become a festival unto us, unto the first of us, and unto the last of us as a sign from Thee; and also to provide food for us, for Thou art the best provider".

When Issa had finished his prayers, the revelation descended: "I have granted thy request and have sent a table, but whoever shall, after having seen it, become ungrateful, shall be chastised by Me, as no one of the inhabitants of the world has been punished ere this". By the words "inhabitants of the world", the people of that age are meant. Issa informed the people of this revelation and they said: "Whoever is ungrateful is worthy of punishment".

Then a table descended from heaven, by the prayers of Issa, over it there was a cloud and also under it. The descent took place slowly, until at last the table became stationary in front of Issa—upon whom be peace—and its fragrant exhalations gratified the senses of all present. Issa and his apostles bowed their heads in adoration and he said: "Let one of you who is most beneficent, and who is most confident of the power of God, arise and remove the cover that we may see the bounties of the Lord, and thank Him for them".

The apostles replied: "Thou art the most fit and worthy to perform this act". Accordingly the Lord Issa fell upon his knees, prayed and removed the cover, after uttering the words: "In the name of Allah the best provider of food".

The people then approached and beheld a table of pure gold, forty cubits long and as many broad, standing on four legs. Upon it they perceived a red cloth, on which there was a roasted fish without scales or fins from which fat was flowing. Around it they saw all kinds of vegetables except onions and leeks. Near the head of the fish there was some salt and near its tail some vinegar. Around it there were five loaves of bread, on each of which there were a few olives, five pomegranates, and two dates.

Shimayûn asked: "O spirit of Allah! is this the food of paradise or of the world?"

Issa replied: "Of neither, but it has descended from heaven". Then the Messiah continued: "Eat ye and pronounce the name of Allah over it".

The apostle said: "O prophet of God begin thou to eat first". Issa refused, and said: "Let every one eat of it who has asked". From the refusal of Issa the apostles knew that the descent of the table was connected with a Divine chastisement [that would follow].

Therefore they agreed with the spirit of Allah [not to eat].

Issa then invited the people, whereon many rich and poor and sick assembled round the table. Every blind man who ate of that food recovered his sight and every sick person was cured of his disease. Immense crowds partook of the food of that table which, however, remained in its first state so that nothing appeared to have been consumed.

According to a tradition the said table descended from heaven during forty days, and again ascended at sunset. Issa caused the people daily to partake of the food, until the revelations arrived that none but orphans, poor, and sick persons be allowed to eat of that food.

This command was deemed very unjust by the rich, and some of them said: "This is not the table of God", whilst others also suspected that it had not descended from heaven.

On that occasion the following divine allocution reached Issa: "On account of the promise that I have made I shall punish the doubters and the ungrateful". It is recorded according to one tradition that after Issa had informed them of the imminent chastisement, four hundred individuals arose one morning from their beds, changed into hogs. They then began to pick up offal from dunghills, came to Issa, laid their heads on the ground, wept tears of repentance on Issa, who called everyone by his name saying: "Thou art such and such a one", which words they confirmed by affirmatively nodding their heads; but after the expiration of three nights and days they gave up their ghosts in the most opprobrious manner.

When the Jews accused his prophetic lordship of falsehood and expelled him from the city, Issa departed with Mariam, and arrived in one of the villages of Syria, where they alighted at the house of one of the nobles of that country, who treated them with respect and kindness, requesting them to take up their abode with him.

One day the gentleman of the house happened to return home full of sadness and grief. He informed Mariam that his distress originated from the fact of the King's desire—who was an oppressor, and accustomed to pay a visit to one of his subjects every evening and to carouse in his house—of spending the night in his abode. and that he had neither the wealth nor power required for entertaining the King with his retinue and servants.

Mariam, who sympathized with the landlord, requested Issa to remedy this difficulty; Issa, however, replied: "This is connected with a great trial". Mariam replied: "This man has great claim to our protection; there is no need to be apprehensive of any trial". The Messiah then complied with his mother's request, ordered the vessels and pots to be filled with water before the banquet, and supplicated the Omnipotent Creator, whereon the vessels became all filled with meat, and the pots with generous red wine, whilst the table was full of bread.

After eating, the King quaffed a bumper, and found that he had tasted delicious wine, the like of which he had never drunk before. He therefore asked his host where he had obtained it, whereon the latter named a certain village; but the King assured him that this wine could not be compared with that of the same place and advised him to tell the truth.

Then the landlord mentioned another town, which so incensed the King that the poor man's life was in danger. He then confessed that in his vicinity there was a youth who had no father, and that anything that he asked from the Almighty Creator was granted, and that all these victuals, together with the wine, had been produced from the invisible world.

The King immediately called for Issa, and wanted him to pray that his son and successor to the throne who had lately died might be resuscitated to life. Issa replied: "If the prince returns to life, thy royalty will be endangered". The King rejoined: "After seeing him, I shall dread no misfortune". Issa continued: "I shall resuscitate the prince to life on the condition that no one shall be allowed to expel me from this country". The King assented, whereon Issa prayed, resuscitated the prince to life, and after performing this miracle departed to another place.

When the son of the king was again alive, the people said: "The oppression of this tyrant has reduced us to extremities; we hoped however that we should be relieved by his death, but now there is no doubt that the son will after the demise of his father renew his opprobrious habits. The remedy therefore is to kill both the father and the son, so as at once to get rid of their violence and tyranny".

They all agreed, and executed their design by drawing the sword of opposition from its scabbard, and exterminating both of them.

After Issa and Mariam had left the said village, they met a Jew who possessed two loaves of bread, while they had only one.

Issa said to the Jew, "Let us have all our provisions in common". The Jew assented, but when he perceived that Issa had only one loaf, he repented of his promise, and during the night secretly disposed of the other loaf.

In the morning Issa told his companion to produce his food, but he shewed only one loaf, whereon Issa asked: "Where is the other?"

But he replied: "I had no other loaf except this one". The Messiah said nothing more, but after they had traveled awhile, they reached a spot where a man was pasturing sheep, and he accosted him with the words: "Owner of the sheep! shew me hospitality".

The shepherd agreed and said: "Tell thy companion to pick out a sheep and to kill it".

Issa then ordered the Jew to kill and roast a sheep, but added: "We must eat it but preserve its bones". After they had finished the repast Issa collected all the unbroken bones, put them into the hide, struck the latter with his staff, saying: "Arise by the command of Allah". The sheep then immediately became alive and Issa said to the shepherd: "Take thy sheep".

The man asked in astonishment: "Who art thou?"

He replied: "I am Issa, the son of Mariam".

The shepherd rejoined: "Thou art a sorcerer about whom we have heard".

After thus insulting him he ran away from Issa, who, when he had performed this miracle, asked the Jew: "Thou hast had two loaves, what hast thou done with the other?"

The Jew, however, swore that he had never more than one loaf. Issa again became silent and they departed also from that place.

Whilst they were journeying they happened to meet a fellow who had several kine. Issa took a calf from him which they slaughtered, roasted, and consumed, whereon the spirit of Allah again resuscitated the calf, as he had done before [to the sheep], and surrendered it to its owner. After that he asked the Jew for the missing loaf, but received the same answer as before. Then they again traveled by common consent, until they separated.

The King of the said town was reposing on the couch of sickness, and his physicians having been unable to cure him, he punished them. When the Jew heard of this matter, he procured a cane resembling the staff of Issa and went to the palace with the intention of imitating him.

He said to the courtiers: "I shall heal your patient, and if he be dead, I shall resuscitate him".

They accordingly led him to the bed of the King, whose feet he repeatedly struck with his staff, and said: "Arise by the command of Allah", but it was of no use.

When his inability to revive the King became evident, the courtiers accused him of having slain their master, and suspended him upside down from a gibbet.

When Issa heard of what had happened he went to the place

of execution, where he saw the Jew with a rope round his neck, and the people wanting to drop him from the head to the foot of the gallows.

Issa said: "If you desire the King to be recalled to life, leave my friend alone".

They replied: "This is our wish, and when the King is again alive we shall let go thy friend".

Issa then prayed to the Lord of Magnificence, resuscitated the King, and delivered the Jew from his scrape.

They departed together, and the Jew having escaped death, said to Issa: "By saving me from death thou hast so highly obliged me, that I swear by Allah never to leave thy service".

The Messiah—upon whom be peace—replied: "I adjure thee by the true God who has resuscitated the sheep and the calf, after we had roasted and eaten them; by that God who resuscitated the King after he had died, and who has granted thee life after having been on the gallows; tell me how many loaves thou hadst in thy possession when beginning to accompany me?" The Jew again swore an oath that he never had more than one loaf. Issa then again placed the seal of taciturnity upon his mouth, and they continued the journey together.

They happened to see a place where a wild beast had, whilst digging about, found a treasure, of which no one had become cognizant till that day.

The Jew asked Issa: "Leaving this treasure untouched, where are we going?"

Issa replied: "Cease these words, for this is the decree of fate, that several persons must perish on account of this treasure".

The Jew having no means of resistance, went in obedience to, and with, the spirit of Allah. After they had departed four men arrived near the treasure, two of whom then went to the city to purchase food and drink, as well as to procure the utensils necessary for the removal of the treasure. The two remaining men had conspired with each other to slay those who had gone, because they wanted to take possession of their shares also. Those, however, who had departed, harbored the same murderous intentions, and mixed a lethal poison with the food. Then they returned and were killed by the swords of their remaining two companions, who in their turn died when they had eaten the poisoned food. Thus all these four individuals pitched their tents in the plain of annihilation. Time addressed the Jew in the language of the circumstances as follows:

> The companions are gone; have reached the term.
> In the sleep of deceit art thou still plunged, careless heart?

After Issa had been informed by Divine revelation he said to the Jew: "Come, let us go to see the treasure".

The greedy fellow having made the necessary preparations for taking possession of and removing the property, departed with the spirit of Allah [*i. e.*, Jesus].

When they reached the spot they beheld the four dead companions, whereon the Lord Issa divided the treasure into three parts, one of which he gave to the Jew and retained the other two for himself. The Jew then said: "O spirit of Allah, thou must be just in making the distribution and must divide the property into two parts, one of which will belong to me and the other to thee".

Issa rejoined: "One share belongs to me, the second to thee, and the third to the owner of the lost loaf".

The Jew asked: "If I point out to thee the owner of the lost loaf, wilt thou surrender to him his portion?"

Issa replied: "Yes".

The Jew continued: "I am the owner of it".

The spirit of Allah said: "Then take possession of the whole treasure, because thy share [of happiness] consists therein in this world and in the next".

That ill-fated individual then took the worldly goods, but when he had traveled a short distance the earth opened, and swallowed him with all he possessed. Let us take refuge with Allah from [the temptations of] this world!

One of the wonderful prodigies of Issa was, that when his lordship was one day passing with his companions through a field, which was almost ripe for the harvest, his friends were hungry and asked permission to eat some of the grain. The revelation having descended to Issa to allow them to do so, they began to eat, but the owner of the harvest suddenly arrived, shouting: "I have inherited this field from my ancestors, by whose permission are you now eating thereof?" The Lord Issa was displeased with this interference, and prayed that all might be resuscitated who had ever been owners of the said field.

This actually took place and on nearly every stalk a man or woman arose, exclaiming: "By whose permission do you commit ravages on my property?"

The owner of the field was confused and asked: "Who produced this miracle?"

They replied: "Issa, the son of Mariam".

Then he approached Issa with excuses, saying: "O spirit of Allah, I knew thee not; now, however, I am cognizant who thou art, and allow thy companions to eat of my harvest".

Issa—upon whom be peace—replied: "In reality this field does not belong to thee, because these people possessed it before thee, and have left it against their will. What happened to them will soon come to pass with thee also".

It is related that one day Issa had placed a stone under his head, and Satan approached his cushion, saying: "Thou thinkest thou art attached to nothing in this world, but this stone also belongs to the world".

Issa then arose and threw the stone towards Satan, exclaiming: "This belongs to thee with the world, and, by my life, the world and its inhabitants belong to thee!"

—I am the slave of him who beneath this azure sky
—Is free from everything that may claim attachment.

Hasan Bossri—mercy be on him—has related that the apostles of Issa said: "O servant of Allah! thou walkest on the surface of the water, and we are unable to do so; what is the reason?"

Issa replied: [I walk thus] "by certainty in Allah—whose name be extolled."

They continued: "We are likewise of those who have obtained certainty".

The spirit of Allah asked: "If you perceive a stone and a jewel on the ground which of them will you pick up?"

They replied: "We would take the jewel".

His lordship continued: "Then you are not of those who have attained certainty".

Hasan Bossri also says that Issa received his mission in his thirteenth year, and that he was taken up to heaven in his thirty-third. Others allege that he had been sent in the seventeenth, and others in this twenty-seventh year.

According to some traditions all the inhabitants of paradise are thirty-three years old, and these words were for a long time difficult to be understood by the author of these pages; but whilst writing it occurred to him that possibly the above years imply maturity of intellect, because the denizens of paradise will forever remain in the same condition, and will never become subject either to decrepitude or to old age.

In the Maarif Hassibi it is related that Issa—upon whom blessing—ascended to heaven in his forty-second year, and that the Gospel was sent down to him in the twelfth year of his age in the town of Nâssra [Nazareth], in a province of the Ardan [Jordan], and that for this reason he is called Nâssâri; Allah, however, is most wise.

This tradition is taken from Rehatsek's edition of Mirkhond's Rawzatus-Safa, a cycle of legends or traditions from the days of the genii and Adam to the founding of the Mussulman power.

EXTRACTS FROM ISIS UNVEILED*

. . . . . The ancient sages, ascending to the UNKNOWABLE, made their starting-point from the first manifestation of the unseen, the unavoidable, and from a strict logical reasoning, the absolutely necessary creative Being, the Demiurgos of the universe. Evolution began with them from pure spirit, which descending lower and lower down, assumed at last a visible and comprehensible form, and became matter. Arrived at this point, they speculated in the Darwinian method, but on a far more large and comprehensive basis.

* Original Edition, Vol. I (Before The Veil), pp. xxx-xxxi.

AROUND THE TABLE

SPINSTER had announced her intention of going town-ward that morning. "I'll go in on the street-car, Father," she said to Doctor, who was stretched out on the couch, drawn up before the open fire. "You really ought to rest right here all day; anyway an automobile in town is more of a nuisance than a help".

"Going to wear a mask, Spinster?" asked Mentor, with a whimsical smile.

"Oh, I guess Karma takes care of its own", returned Spinster airily. "But seriously, Father", she continued, turning to Doctor, "if I ride in the open part of the car, I needn't fear infection, need I?"

"Needn't *fear* anything", was the answer. "It's fear in large part that makes the influenza spread so rapidly. At least, that is my opinion", he continued, "based upon my experience of the last two weeks", and Doctor stretched with a sigh of comfort and turned luxuriously on the couch.

Night and day attendance upon patients for a fortnight or more had exhausted our old friend, who is "not as young as he used to be", in Mother's phrasing, and for whom she had ordered a full twenty-four hours of complete rest. "I find most of my patients frightened half to death", he continued, "and where the influenza spreads in families there has usually been a carefully cultivated, predisposing quality of fright".

"I notice that the children seem not to catch the influenza in any considerable numbers", remarked Mother, looking up from the newspaper she had been reading.

"Well, isn't that a verification of my own theory?" asked Doctor triumphantly. "They aren't afraid, not being wise enough—or rather, *unwise* enough—to be thinking about the influenza and fearing it all the time".

"Yet children are often subject to other sorts of epidemics—whooping-cough, for instance", objected Spinster. Your conclusions seem partial to me, Father. What do you think about it, Mentor?" she asked, "is Doctor's theory correct?"

"It hardly seems to me that a categorical answer can be given in this case", replied Mentor, "for there are many things to be considered. Supposing we say, 'Yes, with certain qualifications'. There is a statement", he continued, "to this effect—'one can have no attachment for that which he does not think about'—but this applies only to present thinking, and does not take into consideration the thoughts of the past, nor their necessary future consequences".

"Let's have the qualifications, please, Mentor", said Doctor. "You said, 'with certain qualifications'," he added, with a questioning chuckle.

"Why, your theory doesn't account in any way for the *cause* of influenza", was the answer. "You are merely theorizing about effects. You observe that fear seems to create in the one who fears a fertile field for the operation of the influenza 'germ'. But why the 'germ'? What is it? What the cause of its presence? Why is it here now, and not here at some other time? Does medical science, or your own experience, satisfactorily answer these questions?"

Doctor was obliged to admit, somewhat unwillingly, that he could not answer them; but was disposed to argue nevertheless, over-tired as he was by his strenuous fortnight of steady attendance upon influenza sufferers. Finally Mother broke in with a maternal, "Nonsense, Father! You're too tired to argue—and anyway, Mentor won't *argue* with you. Why don't you ask him to give us the Theosophical explanation of the epidemic, and then listen to what he says—and consider it!"

Doctor was at once apologetic—"forgot myself", he explained shamefacedly.

Mentor smiled appreciatively, and forthwith began his explanation:

"As theosophical students, we have to consider the various fields in which *effects* are observed and experienced. These fields are, the body and its circumstances; the mind and intellect; the psychic and astral planes. The medical schools do not treat diseases from any other point of view than the physical one, generally speaking, and thus can apply only alleviative remedies at best, without destroying causes. The schools of mental healing ignore the bodily field, and place their reliance on prescribed modes of thinking, taking it for granted that the mental plane is the seat of causation.

"So far, none of the many schools has realized that Man is not his body, his mind nor his circumstances, but the Thinker within, who by his ignorance and desires is the cause of all the sorrow and suffering and disease which he experiences. Each one therefore suffers in any event from causes set in motion by himself, as well as from causes which he in common with others have set in motion. All this is under the law of Karma, or 'sowing and reaping'. The Thinker or real man is the experiencer of the various effects produced, whether these be psychical, mental or physical.

"Theosophy shows that there is a state of subtle substance that surrounds our earth, as it does every other, an envelope as it were, which is the receiver and container of the moral and physical emanations of the earth and its inhabitants; these are all converted into their subtlest essence, and radiated back intensified, thus becoming *epidemics*—moral, psychic and physical. Persons subject to epidemics, or any disease, are the very people who had a hand in producing them, either in this or a previous life.

"Considering these facts, it would hardly be correct to assume that fear in itself is a predisposing cause. I think it will be found that many who fear and many who have no fear at all are overtaken

by epidemics. Fear arises from doubt and ignorance, and it may be that those who fear disease or epidemic have a psychic perception of their liability under the law. Again, those who have no fear at all place their reliance entirely upon their supposed bodily immunity: yet the law works regardless of fear, or the lack of it.

"Another angle to the question lies in the fact that every human being contains in germ every defect that exists anywhere in the race, any one of which may spring into activity under favorable conditions; in this the imagination or image-making power of the Thinker may at any given time fertilize a germ that otherwise would remain latent. When we study the question from every point of view, we will not be disposed to place our reliance on phrases, but rather upon the inexorable law of our own being, which, however we may presently think, desire or feel, will bring us weal or woe as we have earned them. Thus relying we really fear nothing, but accept what comes as our just deserts."

There was a silence when Mentor had finished speaking. Finally Doctor nodded his head—"something to think about there", he said meditatively—"always gets back to the action of Law, doesn't it, Mentor?"

"It *must*", was the reply, "if we are to do any straight and truly basic thinking. We spend our time considering *effects*, so often without looking deeper. Theosophical study—and application, of course—is the only cure for this surface way of looking at things."

* * * * * * *

"Going to wear your mask, Spinster?" asked Mentor again, later on in the morning, as that young lady departed for the street-car, and thence to town.

"Oh, Karma takes care of its own", she called back to him, with a merry laugh.

"Not a bad practice at that", remarked Doctor ruminatively from his couch.

"Not for those *who think so*", said Mentor.

FROM THE SECRET DOCTRINE*

While the Christian is taught that the human soul is a breath of God—being created by him for sempiternal existence, *i. e.*, having a beginning, *but no end* (and therefore never to be called eternal)—the Occult teaching says, *"Nothing is created, but is only transformed.* Nothing can manifest itself in this universe—from a globe down to a vague, rapid thought—that was not in the universe already; everything on the subjective plane is an eternal IS; as everything on the objective plane is an *ever becoming*—because transitory."

* From the Original Edition, Vol. I, p. 570; see Vol. I, p. 622 Third Edition.

ON THE LOOKOUT

> "Through all the ages weaklings have sought, outside of themselves, surcease from the ills of humanity. The great philosophers have taught and retaught that within ourselves only may we find solace for our agony; but only the great, the strong, have been susceptible to their teachings."

Arthur Somers Roche is a writer of novels, *alias* detective stories, and the quotation is from the November instalment of "The Eyes of the Blind," now running in *Everybody's*. The philosophy expressed may be employed by the writer as a mere condiment, and be regarded by most readers as a decorative effect, or at best as a judicious use of verbal spotlight to throw into imaginative relief the character of *Randolph Fallon*. However all this may be, it does not vary nor affect the validity of the statement, nor lessen the significance of its appearance. On the contrary, like a light shining in darkness, the abrupt interjection of such an expression of never-changing truth into the midst of professed fiction may, quite independently of the consciousness of author or casual reader, serve a clear and definite purpose. For the reader of fiction is now and again one who turns to it because he dies of the unexplained monotony of his daily round of life, or from sheer despair over the "realities" that confront and confound him, rather than from idleness of mind. When we consider the all-quickening nature of "universal mind" or true Wisdom, we can understand that Those who have "the whole of nature for Their object" use all natures and all circumstances as soil or instrument of sowing. "Those who are ready" receive the divine impregnation; others "receive but a spark;" others again derive only pleasure or pain from fact or fiction. So the vernal impulsion of immortal life may as well spring up in one set of circumstances as another, and is, in fact, in all things and in all places, instant and ready for our seeing, if we are but looking. "The seeds of Wisdom cannot sprout and grow in airless space." They are in all the circumstances of life to "those who are ready to accept truth wherever it may be found." To all others, circumstances, real or imagined, are only circumstances, because they are not looking to "see in each event a deep significance, an *occult* meaning."

We learn by contrasts, and nature's sharpest lessons to her dullest pupils are by way of extreme contrasts. It "happens" that LOOKOUT turns from Mr. Arthur Somers Roche with his "Eyes of the Blind," only to confront, or be confronted with, "Presbyterian Self-Doubts," as the *Literary Digest* for July 27 calls them, in referring to an article in the Philadelphia *Presbyterian* in which the writer thinks agitation within the fold "tends to give the feeling that the Church doubts her specific mission and fears her own exhaustion, and therefore seeks affiliation of strength and security." The *Presbyterian* writer, like Mr. Roche on *Randolph Fallon*, moralizes on the particular brand of fiction represented by his Church after this wise:

> "There is now a tendency to magnify the physical interests of men over the intellectual and spiritual life. There has also been an increase of the formal over the simple in our mode of worship, and in some cases it has become cold and mechanical. . . . In certain parts and congregations of the Church, catholicity has gone to seed and been carried to the extreme, and they are fellowshiping with those who deny the Bible, and the Deity, and Divine work and teachings of our Lord. . . . Our people are inclined to send their youth to State or non-evangelical institutions, with the result that they return unbelievers, and are lost to the Church. Our family life has been very greatly reduced and neglected, causing a decrease of the growth of the Church from within itself. . . . New communicants go out of the back door nearly as fast as they come in at the front door. . . . The Church is still outspoken in her loyalty to the

> Bible, but some of the seminaries seek its destruction, and the Church acquiesces in silence."

"*Fallon,*" says novelist Roche, "was a spiritual coward. He had convinced himself that life had been unfair to him. He believed that the universe had conspired against him, was bent on dragging him down. Through his sodden brain surged the hatred of the lost for the saved. In his own eyes he was the most tragic figure in the world." *Hinc illae lachrimae,* whether of the *Randolph Fallons* of fiction or real life, or of the churches. The *Presbyterian* writer, being fully persuaded that the world exists for the sake of the Church, the Church for the sake of the Bible, and the Bible for the sake of the ministerial *Randolph Fallons,* is bewildered by what he sees going on in the fold. But we cannot think, as does the *Digest,* that this is *self*-doubt. Would that it were. The *Presbyterian* writer, to take him at his own expression, doubts the congregations, doubts the Presbyterian seminaries, doubts the world, but doubts not at all either himself or the dogmas of his church. "There is something wrong," but it seems to him that wrong lies anywhere but in his personal or Presbyterian viewpoint. All of which reminds one of the good old *Autocrat of the Breakfast Table* who philosophized to the effect that "a bigot and the pupil of the eye are the only counterparts in nature: both contract the more, the more light is poured on them." All the lessons of circumstance are lost to the spiritual coward or the spiritual bigot: even the terrific lessons of this mighty war, or the spiritual unrest now harrowing the souls of mankind.

But bigotry is not the characteristic of any particular sect; it is inherent in the nature of sectarianism itself. It is not, therefore, peculiar to the Presbyterian church, but is as bound up in any sect, creed or party as the effect is bound up in the cause. So long as there are "leaders" there will be bigots, for "bigot" originally meant hypocrite: one who pretends to be what he is not, to know what he is ignorant of. So long as there are "leaders" of this kind there will be sects, for "sectary" means a "follower." So long as there are the blind they will follow "leaders," even though they be blind leaders of the blind. Both are the concomitant of ignorance—ignorance as to the meaning of events and our relation to them; ignorance as to our own spiritual nature and the spiritual law of our action. If, then, we turn for the moment to another Church of wide credence amongst Protestants, we can but expect to find the same fatuous consideration of circumstance. Thus the Rev. Vernon Wade, writing in the (Methodist) *Western Christian Advocate,* bemoans the recrudescence of pagan beliefs among the millions of soldiers who, faced with the whirlwind smiting arguments of shot and shell, have cast off sectarian beliefs as they would throw aside any other useless encumbering thing in the "imminent, deadly breach" of war. He says:

> "Are we to be resigned to an Omnipotence without a character? . . . Against Mohammedanism, our heaviest competitor, and the war-fatalism, Christianity is having a struggle to the last ditch. . . . Present day experiences demand a surety other than the ordinary thinking will bring—the surety of Christian hope. . . . Hope helps with God, and there is a wonderful safety in this great expectation that is rooted in the promises of God."

Reverend Wade characterizes and summarizes the "working religion" of the soldiers and the to-be-soldiers in this monologue fashion: "I will be in certain battles; I will be in constant danger of wounds and death. I cannot help the danger. No use. I am fated either to escape the death or to be killed. *Cause and effect determine all things.*" And it is this formulation as a working hypothesis, this tentative strategy of self-sacrifice, that the soldiers have adopted with the uniform of war, in place of the *mufti* of the sects, that affrights the creedal bigots in the midst of their feast of self-complacency. Belshazar at least could see the handwriting on the wall,

and when his own priests could not interpret, had Karmic stamina enough to find one who could translate. No more than the writer in the *Presbyterian*, can the reverend Wade learn anything from this portentous soldier-faith; no more than Belshazzar can the handwriting benefit him even when read. It is a "conspiracy" of the Evil One, of the times, of the soldiers, of the universe, against him, his creed, his dogmas, his Bible, his God.

Still another contrast is afforded by Mr. William Archer in the *Westminster Gazette* (London) who puts what the *Digest*, with engaging but unintentional frankness, as we surmise, calls "the *common-sense view*" of the layman on this subject of "fatalism." Mr. Archer writes:

> "Fatalism is not specially the creed of the trenches; it is the creed, or rather the theory of most thinking men. But to suppose that fatalism implies, inculcates, or in any way encourages foolhardiness is to show a total misconception of its meaning. . . . It is, in fact, a sort of negation of fatalism to let fatalism influence our actions (choice?). . . . It is the part of the wise man to act wisely in whatever conjuncture he may find himself, knowing that it is quite as futile for him to contrive how to fulfil his fate as to contrive how to evade it."

He goes on to say that "in a vague, illogical way, we imply that it lies within our choice whether to be fatalists or not, forgetting that the very fatalism which impels us to do this or that is as much a part of the web of our fate as any other factor in the complex of forces which determines our action at any given moment."

One who has studied with any attention and desire to learn the synthetic and therefore inclusive teachings of Theosophy, sees clearly more than one meaning behind all these contrasted gropings and partial perceptions of circumstances and their import. Whether Presbyterian, Methodist, soldier in the trenches, or layman, it is clear they all have been and are being shaken loose from the moorings of habitual ideas, beliefs and opinions. It is not a case of the "Wind of circumstance" blowing them over or swerving them from their ruts of thought, so much as it is a *débacle*, a mental and moral earthquake convulsing and breaking to pieces the ice or the ground under their feet. Like a man fallen asleep in a drunken stupor and partly roused from his sleep or his nightmare by a gigantic earthquake, they are not quite sure whether their dizziness is due to the remains of their intoxication or to the giving way of the earth beneath them. The symptoms are similar. But the theosophical student knows that it is in fact the break-up of the firm molds of thought of the race mind that is affecting the divers and diverse minds which make up the race-mind. It is a transition point for the *race*, not merely for isolated individuals or sects or parties. All that is apparent is confusion of thought and of tongues. Governments, social ideas, rooted religious formulas, all the many grooves of thoughts and fixed ideas of relationships, all are in flux; and this flux is the prelude to metempsychosis, a transformation of soul and mind—new forms of government, new ideas of class and social considerations, new and better forms of religion, higher and deeper conceptions of "universal brotherhood." Every progression of that collectivity of souls called Humanity to a higher state of consciousness must necessarily present the external aspect of dissolution and retrogression to those whose eyes still remain fixed upon the conservation of what has been. It is at once a sloughing of old forms and a spiritual incarnation in a higher form: death and destruction on the one hand; rebirth and metempsychosis, whether from egg to larva, from larva to pupa, or from pupa to a matured and enduring form, if looked at from the standpoint of the evolution of Soul. We will do well to remember that "the Theosophical Society was founded to become the corner-stone of the *new religion of Humanity*." So, from the inclusive point of view of The-

osophy, the gospel of the enduring Soul in the midst of all changing things, it is easy to comprehend that the present-day "fatalism" is but the Western dim perception of the Law of Karma; the unrest in the Churches a still dimmer feeling of portent; the shake-ups of governments, of the long-held ideas of the relation of capital and labor, but the quickening or the swelling of the leaven of theosophical ideas in the womb of the race-mind. For the divine impartation from the Masters of Wisdom embodied in the work of H. P. B. and by Her sown broadcast in the world has not yet germinated; it is only beginning to swell. But the immensity of the forces at work, their universal impact, may be judged by the displacements now going on in every religion of human thought and action—the organs of the "body politic" of Humanity. H. P. B. did not come merely to found a Society, nor only to impart to a favored few some privileged seeds of wisdom, but verily "to break the molds of men's minds, to leaven the whole loaf of Humanity." We are Humanity, but there is all too little humanity amongst us, despite our pretentious formulations of "brotherhood," of "government," of "religion," and of "charity." We are all more or less, and more rather than less, bigots and sectaries. And it is this that is in process of change, dissolution and death; coincident, and necessarily so, with the metempsychosis that will eventuate in a *practical* realization of Theosophy, "the formation of a *nucleus* of a Universal Brotherhood of Mankind, without distinction of race, creed, sex, or condition." Then, and then only, "will the accretions begin which will end in future years, however far, in the new religion of *humanity*."

In one of the ancient Aryan parables there is a tale of a wise man who entered the world to give help, and on his return to his own world related his experiences somewhat in this manner: "I found there a mad world, with madmen teaching other madmen. Those who were most mad were accounted the greatest sages amongst them. I learned much, but was able to help but little." We wonder what this Rishi of old would remark concerning a full page editorial in *The Christian Science Monitor* of October 8, entitled "A Mad World." The article has been largely reprinted in advertisements paid for by Christian Science Churches. Says the editorial in question:

> "Fear is the most prolific sourse of all evil. . . .
>
> "Some day the world will come to see that what it calls contagion is a mental contagion, and that what it calls infection is the infection of one mind from another. . . . Fear in a Christian community should be self-condemned. . . . Let any person who has been brought in contact with the conditions of today ask himself frankly whether it is not fear which is playing such fearful havoc in the world. Everywhere men and women are afraid. . . A great fear has stricken the world, and it is little wonder if out of this fear there have emerged pestilences and disease which have mounted on the wings of fear, and scattered their seeds in every direction.
>
> "In such circumstances what would it be expected that a Christian community should do? Would it not, remembering the words of the Bible that 'perfect love casteth out fear,' be to ask itself if there were not something amiss with its understanding of love which makes love powerless to overcome fear? . . .
>
> "Yet, at the moment when the churches should be filling the minds of the people with peace, and reassuring them of the impotency of evil, it is proposed that these churches shall be shut, and that the admission shall be made that it is dangerous for men and women to congregate to worship God, for fear the Lord's arm is so shortened that He cannot contend with microbes. On the other hand, if people believe that God sends pestilence into the world for the good of the

world, what right have they to protect themselves against this pestilence, and to attempt by the drinking of drugs, by methods of segregation, or by any means at all, to prevent the anger of the Lord from taking effect? The very fact that all men and women endeavor to protect themselves against disease, at all times, is the proof, to any sane person, that in its heart the world does not believe that discord proceeds from Principle, that death comes out of life, or that reprisals are the work of love.

"'The way,' writes Mrs. Eddy, in a famous sentence on page 201 of Science and Health, 'to extract error from mortal mind is to pour in truth through flood-tides of Love.'"

"Source," says the dictionary, "means the origin, the first cause." Fear is the source of all evil, says the first premise of Christian Science. Contagion and infection, pestilence and disease are mental, is the minor premiss Evil is therefore of the mind, mental, and mind is the source of all evil. "Things equal to the same thing are equal to each other." Hence, fear being the *most prolific* source (or *first cause*), and mind, also, being the source, of the evils of pestilence and disease, of contagion and infection, mind and fear are the same thing. *Ergo,* to destroy fear, you have but to destroy mind; or, in destroying fear, the "most prolific first cause of *all* evil," you necessarily destroy "mental" infection and contagion because you destroy mind, the cause of some evils. Q. E. D.

But it is suggested that in the midst of these evils the churches should be "filling the minds of the people with peace" which will also destroy evil because it will destroy fear. It is wisely omitted to instruct how the cause of contagion is to be filled with peace after, or before, mind is destroyed in destroying fear.

"Any sane person," to borrow the phrase of the *Monitor,* knows, both by his own experience and his observation of others, that in any and every case, fear is *caused* by ignorance or partial understanding. Numberless things in the past have caused us to fear, whether for ourselves, for our possessions, or for others. When the things were understood, fear ceased. In any and every case, fear is an *effect,* not a "source" or *cause.* When causes are understood, effects can be controlled or dissipated. The same person who fears one thing at one time will at another time have no fear at all of the same thing. Did the freedom from fear come from circumstances or better understanding, *or from the disappearance of the thing feared?*

Any one conversant with history knows that of all peoples on the face of the earth, past or present, Christians most fear death. Why? Any one at all conversant with the facts of Mrs. Eddy's life, or with the rise of the Christian Science Church, and capable of relating cause and effect in a minor degree, even, knows that her peculiar system was born of her fears and disease; that all her life *fear* possessed her, now of one thing and now of another, finally of "malicious animal magnetism," but always *fear;* that all her affirmations and denials, all her syncopated utterances were neither more nor less than fortifications for *protection.* Protection against what? Against infection and contagion, against "evils," against fear whether in physical or mental form. And as well, "any sane person" at all conversant with the facts knows that the membership of Mrs. Eddy's Church has been drawn to her "teachings" and her church through seeking relief from disease, from fear, from "evil." What *knowledge* had Mrs. Eddy, what knowledge have her followers, of cause and effect, of birth, life, death, post mortem or ante-mortem relations and conditionings of Spirit, Soul and Body? "Science and Health and Key to the Scriptures" is an appeal to fear and the symptoms of fear in the minds of Souls in ignorance of their real nature and the real nature of earthly existence, and who are suffering from the effects mental and physical, of that ignorance.

"The embodied Soul being *gifted* with faith," says Krishna in *Bhagavad-Gita,* "each man is of the same nature as that ideal on which his faith is fixed." Many people come in the course of life to that point where they lose all faith in the possibility of peace and happiness here below. Such naturally transfer their faith to post-mortem regions and become devotees of some form of religion which promises heaven hereafter. Others, still longing for health and well-being here, fix their faith on that ideal which promises freedom from pain and evil here and now. It is to such that Christian Science makes a powerful appeal. Some men turn to drink in order to "forget" themselves and their troubles; others to drugs; others to suicide; others, and by far the larger portion of mankind, to some ideal of spiritual existence whether now or hereafter. In times of great distress whether individual or collective, any one who believes he has a remedy, who pretends to have a remedy, or who merely seeks to make a profit out of the ills of mankind, can gain a ready hearing. The identical nature of all these panaceas, systems and formulas lies in a fact always overlooked by those who fall victim: Not one of them gives knowledge; not one of them understands the *causes* of the effects they profess to relieve or cure. The medical empiricist says, "Swallow this, my medicine, and *obey the laws of health,* and *it* will cure you." The religious empiricist or enthusiast says, "Swallow this, my formula, obey the moral laws, and *it* will cure you." Being gifted with faith the embodied Soul "swallows" the one and obeys the other, let us say, and is relieved or cured for the time being. He goes on his way rejoicing and proclaiming far and wide, "Great is Diana of the Ephesians. My physician and his remedy have cured me. Go thou and do likewise." The sophistry is perceived neither by physician nor patient. Whatever relief is had is due to the *faith of the patient* and the *obedience to the laws of health,* physical, mental or moral: in neither case is there an increase of knowledge; rather a deeper plunge into ignorance, through the false attribution of the source of the relief gained. The devotee who, full of faith, kisses the bones of a saint, is cured and becomes a confirmed Catholic. The devotee who, full of faith, is mesmerized by a "healer" and receives the "suggestions" is also "cured" and pins his reliance on the healer and his system. The devotee who, full of faith, accepts the "affirmations" of Christian Science and its "practitioners," is "cured" and forthwith "knows" that Mrs. Eddy's teachings are the truth about God, Nature and Man. *Mirabile dictu.*

Meantime religions, let alone sects, come and go and come again, but the evils of humanity grow no less. One form of disease or sorrow driven away, another and perchance more malignant takes its place. Nothing but knowledge of Karma and reincarnation and its application by the individual to his own everyday thought and action can ever really *cure,* because nothing else but this knowledge and its application can destroy the *cause* of all sorrow and all suffering—ignorance and selfishness. Karma and reincarnation are the laws of healthy as of unhealthy action; of true as of false living; of good as of evil; for they are the laws of the Soul itself. In the one case it is the action of Soul with knowledge of its own nature and powers and responsibilities; in the other case it is the action of Soul in ignorance or misconception of its own nature, powers and responsibilities. In either case, it is the action of Soul which produces the effects experienced by souls. No practice, no formula, no prescription, whether physical or religious, can at best do any more than postpone and therefore accumulate, or transfer to more obscure and lesser understood, and therefore infinitely more dangerous departments of our nature, our visible and felt evils. Nothing but true knowledge and right application can *cure.* Pain, physical or moral, *is a symptom, not a disease.* We do not cure the disease by killing the pain or destroying the symptoms. All religions are aimed at symptoms, and Christian Science pre-eminently so. It is, on that account the more dangerous to true health and mental sanity. We have never known a

confirmed Christian Scientist—and we have known many—who did not exhibit all the pathological indices of nervous, psycho-physiological and mental deterioration, due to the *soul-deadening* effects of taking as a religious ideal the destruction of pain—the one sure symptom of organic disaffection.

This is a terrible statement. It is not made as an indictment of Christian Scientists, nor in derision of their faith. On the contrary, Christian Scientists are as much our brothers as any; and their faith has our respect as much as any other faith professed and sincerely held by any of our brother men. It is very real to them and to them stands for the highest truth. *But the statement is true*, and if we would not be Cain we must make it. *Christian Science closes the doors of discrimination* by denying and shutting out contrasts and comparisons to those who enter it. They can only remain Scientists by keeping those doors shut and locked from the inside. They become Scientists by killing the channels of comparison, physically, mentally and morally. Discrimination once lost, how can any one learn; how can he even know that he has lost his discrimination? *For he has destroyed his means of spiritual knowledge* as the price of acquiring "freedom from pain." "Good" to him has become that which is pleasant; "evil," that which is painful. To Esau it was "good" to exchange his birthright for a mess of pottage. To the Arabs al-kohol was the water of life and no price too high to pay for intoxication; to the Hindu fakir the transfer of his personal consciousness to a state of bliss by mental and psychic "abstraction" and to the utter neglect and betrayal of his duties as man and as citizen is "good." Christian Science holds out as religion the attainment of the "good" by denying the existence of the "evil" in one's self and in the world, and to attain that "good" severs at a stroke the moral and spiritual bond of responsibility to all one's fellows for one's own actions, past, present, and to come. My sufferings do not spring from my own and my fellow's perverted actions. They spring from "mortal mind" which is a delusion and non-existent. All good belongs to me. No evil belongs to me. I have no responsibility except to gain "good" and to deny "evil." Could any ideal be in sober fact more horrible, more soul-stupefying, be more calculated to ensure the bondage utter and complete of spirit to matter, than this? True, the sufferer to whom it is offered does not see what is involved in the "good" offered to him. No more did Esau; no more does the Arab, the Indian. He hungers for emancipation from a present intolerable condition, and does not see that what in fact is proposed is only a more terrible bondage, a psychic, a mental, a moral and a spiritual bondage in exchange for bodily and personal emancipation from pain for the time being. True, the confirmed devotee of Christian Science does not see that he has sold his immortal nature into the bondage of spiritual selfishness, in exchange for the pottage of personal irresponsibility which he calls "freedom from evil." How could he see? How can the man under a spell, drugged whether in body or mind or moral nature, see while the spell endures, to what frightful pass he has come. Everything is roseate, blissful, "good," to him. There is no "evil." And will he not, the more certainly the more he is enmeshed in his drug-habit, take deeper and still deeper potations to prolong his artificial "heaven," and pay any and every price to maintain his supply of the drug? Physical narcotics, intoxicants and drugs are powerful and produce their heavens and their "freedom from pain" for a time, but at what a price? How much more powerful, how much more insidious, how much more sinister and far-reaching in their ultimate consequences for woe, are the astral, psychic, mental, moral and spiritual panaceas and practices offered to mankind in the name of the Highest, only the true student of the Wisdom-Religion *knows*, though the congenital and chronic physical, mental and spiritual wrecks amongst men everywhere bear witness and warning of that *loss of discrimination* to which the teachings and practices of Christian Science are a straight road.